



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,888	09/20/2000	Chris Connaughton	2100226-991100	6813

30074 7590 05/19/2005

TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
SUITE 1800
425 WALNUT STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202-3957

EXAMINER

SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

47

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/665,888

Applicant(s)

CONNAUGHTON, CHRIS

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-21 and 23-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-21 and 23-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1-1) Claims 1, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Ching (US 6560620, filed Aug 3, 1999).

Regarding claims 1, 12, Aiken teaches detecting ... files (ie., document A and B arranged right –left)(fig 6, item 606; col 16, lines 50-60).

Aiken does not expressly teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing the groups ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

Aiken teaches “comparing ... right file” (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2).

Aiken teaches “generating ... result file” (ie., fig 6, item 606 screen shot is a result screen that shows document A and B with their format and comparison results in the 602 pane).

Aiken teaches “wherein ... in the file” (ie., fig 6, item 618A is compared to item 618B – which are comparisons of text segments in the documents)(col 18, lines 3-18 describes a text segment by text segment comparison).

Aiken in view of Tamura does not teach, but Ching teaches

Art Unit: 2176

Wherein generating a comparison result file includes at least one of the computer-implemented steps of: (a) displaying the comparison result file to a user (ie., result of comparing two documents is displayed side-by-side)(col 4, lines 5-10, 50-55), and (b) storing the comparison result file in a computer-readable storage medium (ie., database repository utilizing hierarchal file system for storage of the compared documents where modification after comparison are stored in a file that use can recall; the examiner interprets that modifications after comparison are results stored in the hierarchical file system)(col 15, lines 39-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura, providing the benefit of crating documents with an open document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40), further to include the results of two documents displayed to the user side-by-side where the resulting modifications after the comparison are stored in the hierarchical file system as taught by Ching, providing the benefit of comparing documents, displaying them side-by-side on a computer, allowing a user to efficiently identify and view segments that are different (Ching, col 53-57).

1-2) Claims 2, 4, 6, 13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996).

Regarding claims 2, 13, Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches detecting ... files (ie., allocating tags for identification, in order to compare the text string that lies between the tags)(col 7, lines 25-35; col 8, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching to include allocating the character strings between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 4, 15, Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches delaying ... intact (ie., system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device and stores the difference data in a secondary memory unit)(col 13, lines 56-60; col 8, line 50 – col 9, line 5; Fig 11B shows the difference between two documents, maintaining the formatting of the modified groups, fig 3A and 3B comparison).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching to include system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device and stores the difference data in a secondary memory unit as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 6, Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches normalization ... of the file (ie., parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison)(col 3, line 62 – col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching to include parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

1-3) Claims 3, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996), further in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Popp et al (US 6651108, filed Aug 14, 1995).

Regarding claims 3, 14, Aiken in view of Tamura, Aoyama and Ching does not teach, but Popp teaches “files ... HTML tags” (ie., block of HTML statements, HTML template)(col 2, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Aoyama and Ching to include block of HTML statements as taught by Popp, providing the benefit of one-to-one mapping

between each HTMO element and object classes ... to manipulate the HTML element within an HTML document (Popp, Abstract).

Regarding claim 16, Aiken teaches “normalizer ... in the files” (ie., fig 6, item 618A is compared to item 618B – which are comparisons of text segments in the documents)(col 18, lines 3-18 describes a text segment by text segment comparison).

Regarding claim 17, Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches normalization ... of the file (ie., parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison)(col 3, line 62 – col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching to include parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 19, Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching does not teach, but Aoyama teaches “means for ... comparison” (ie, allocate the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag)(col 7, lines 27-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching to include allocating the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly

taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 20, Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching does not teach, but Aoyama teaches “character ... left files” (ie., document tree which parses a structured document into nodes, then processes each node by comparing character of the nodes)(col 3, line 63 – col 4, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching to include document tree which parses a structured document into nodes, then processes each node by comparing character of the nodes as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 21, Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching does not teach, but Aoyama teaches “detecting ... preformatting end tag” (ie., identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags)(col 3, lines 50-60; col 7, lines 20-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Popp and Ching to include identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

1-4) Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Ching (as cited above) , further in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996), further in view of Blumer et al (US 5890171, issued mar 1999)

Regarding claim 7, Aiken in view of Tamura, Ching and Aoyama does not teach, but Blumer teaches "converting relative URLs into absolute URLs in the file" (ie., a program that converts relative URL to an absolute URL)(col 8, lines 44-48; col 11, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Ching and Aoyama to include converting relative URL to an absolute URL as taught by Blumer to provide the benefit of an improved system for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

1-5) Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Tavor et al (US 6070149, filed Jul 1998).

Regarding claim 23, Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching does not teach, but Tavori teaches "... removing header tags ..." (ie., deleting mark-up tags from a list; where the header consists of CGI program and a heading)(col 30, lines 10-15; col 10, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching to include deleting mark-tags that include CGI headers as taught by Tavor, providing the benefit of translating data received from the user to a language that the system understands for further usage (Tavor, col 10, lines 55-59).

1-6) Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Crosby et al (US 607848, filed Mar 1999).

Regarding claim 24, Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching does not teach, but Crosby teaches “removing ... files” (ie., distilling can include transforming the PostScript file to a PDF file format)(col 2, lines 55 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching to include distilling a PostScript file to a PDF format as taught by Crosby providing the benefit of displaying a document with dynamic content for display in a static environment (Crosby, col 2, lines 35-45).

1-7) Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Arora et al (US 5911145, issued Jun 8, 1999).

Regarding claim 25, Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching does not teach, but Arora teaches “removing intradocument links from the files” (ie., remove a link between

pages that are part of a web site consisting or several related pages that link back to each other and homepage)(col 1, line 59 – col 2, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Ching to include removing links between pages that are part of a web site that link to one another as taught by Arora, providing the benefit of having a consistent style for all pages of a site (col 2, lines 7-14).

1-8) Claims 8, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996), further in view of Ching (as cited above) .

Regarding claim 8, Aiken teaches “detecting ... files” (ie., document A and B arranged right –left)(fig 6, item 606; col 16, lines 50-60).

Aiken teaches “comparing ... right file” (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2).

Aiken teaches “generating ... result file” (ie., fig 6, item 606 screen shot is a result screen that shows document A and B with their format and comparison results in the 602 pane).

Aiken teaches “wherein ... in the file” (ie., fig 6, item 618A is compared to item 618B – which are comparisons of text segments in the documents)(col 18, lines 3-18 describes a text segment by text segment comparison).

Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches “wherein ... comparison” (ie., allocate the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag)(col 7, lines 27-30).

Aiken in view of Aoyama does not teach, but Ching teaches *Wherein generating a comparison result file includes at least one of the computer-implemented steps of: (a) displaying the comparison result file to a user (ie., result of comparing two documents is displayed side-by-side)(col 4, lines 5-10, 50-55), and (b) storing the comparison result file in a computer-readable storage medium (ie., database repository utilizing hierarchal file system for storage of the compared documents where modification after comparison are stored in a file that use can recall; the examiner interprets that modifications after comparison are results stored in the hierarchical file system)(col 15, lines 39-55).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include allocating the character strings between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section), further to include the results of two documents displayed to the user side-by-side where the resulting modifications after the comparison are stored in the hierarchical file system as taught by Ching, providing the benefit of comparing documents, displaying them side-by-side on a computer, allowing a user to efficiently identify and view segments that are different (Ching, col 53-57).

Regarding claim 9, Aiken teaches “normalization ... left files” (ie., punctuation, white space removed; fig 3 shows processing of each character in item 302)(col 5, lines 52-67).

Regarding claim 10, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches “detecting ... end tag” (ie., identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags)(col 3, lines 50-60; col 7, lines 20-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include allocating the character strings between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

1-9) Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996), further in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998) .

Regarding claim 11, Aiken in view of Aoyama and Ching does not teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing the groups ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Aoyama and Ching to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura, providing the benefit of crating documents with an open

document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40).

1-10) Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Arora et al (US 5911145, issued Jun 8, 1999), further in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Blumer (as cited above).

Regarding claim 18, Aiken in view of Tamura, Ching, Arora and Popp does not teach, but Blumer teaches “converting relative URLs into absolute URLs in the file” (ie., a program that converts relative URL to an absolute URL)(col 8, lines 44-48; col 11, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Ching, Arora and Popp to include converting relative URL to an absolute URL as taught by Blumer to provide the benefit of an improved system for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

1-11) Claims 26, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Ching (as cited above), in view of Popp (as defined above).

Regarding claims 26, 33, Aiken teaches “detecting ... files” (ie., document A and B arranged right –left)(fig 6, item 606; col 16, lines 50-60).

Aiken teaches "detecting ... characters" (ie., punctuation, white space removed; fig 3 shows processing of each character in item 302)(col 5, lines 52-67).

Aiken in view of Ching does not teach, but Popp teaches "each of which ... HTML document is rendered" (ie., block of HTML statements, HTML template)(col 2, lines 1-5).

Aiken teaches "comparing ... right file" (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2).

Aiken teaches "generating ... group" (ie., fig 6, item 606 screen shot is a result screen that shows document A and B with their format and comparison results in the 602 pane).

Aiken does not teach, but Ching teaches
Wherein generating a comparison result file includes at least one of the computer-implemented steps of: (a) displaying the comparison result file to a user (ie., result of comparing two documents is displayed side-by-side)(col 4, lines 5-10, 50-55), and (b) storing the comparison result file in a computer-readable storage medium (ie., database repository utilizing hierarchal file system for storage of the compared documents where modification after comparison are stored in a file that use can recall; the examiner interprets that modifications after comparison are results stored in the hierarchical file system)(col 15, lines 39-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to to include the results of two documents displayed to the user side-by-side where the resulting modifications after the comparison are stored in

the hierarchical file system as taught by Ching, providing the benefit of comparing documents, displaying them side-by-side on a computer, allowing a user to efficiently identify and view segments that are different (Ching, col 53-57), further include block of HTML statements as taught by Popp, providing the benefit of one-to-one mapping between each HTML element and object classes ... to manipulate the HTML element within an HTML document (Popp, Abstract).

1-12) Claims 27, 28, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998).

Regarding claim 27, Aiken in view of Ching and Popp does not expressly teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing the groups ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ching and Popp to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura, providing the benefit of crating documents with an open document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40).

Regarding claim 28, Aiken teaches "line-by-line ... groups" (ie., describes a text-segment by text segment comparison of corresponding text-segments)(col 18, lines 3-18).

Regarding claim 32, Aiken in view of Ching and Popp does not expressly teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

Aiken teaches “comparing ... right file” (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2). Specifically, a skilled artisan upon normalizing by removing the carriage returns from the documents (as taught by Tamura) would be in a position to compare the two documents.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ching and Popp to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura, providing the benefit of crating documents with an open document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40).

1-13) Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Tavor et al (US 6070149, filed Jul 1998).

Regarding claim 29, Aiken in view of Ching, Popp and Tamura does not teach, but Tavor teaches “... removing header tags ...” (ie., deleting mark-up tags from a list; where the header consists of CGI program and a heading)(col 30, lines 10-15; col 10, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ching, Popp and Tamura to include deleting mark-

Art Unit: 2176

tags that include CGI headers as taught by Tavor, providing the benefit of translating data received from the user to a language that the system understands for further usage (Tavor, col 10, lines 55-59).

1-14) Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Crosby et al (US 607848, filed Mar 1999).

Regarding claim 30, Aiken in view of Ching, Popp and Tamura does not teach, but Crosby teaches “removing ... files” (ie., distilling can include transforming the PostScript file to a PDF file format)(col 2, lines 55 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ching, Popp and Tamura to include distilling a PostScript file to a PDF format as taught by Crosby providing the benefit of displaying a document with dynamic content for display in a static environment (Crosby, col 2, lines 35-45).

1-15) Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Ching (as cited above), further in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Arora et al (US 5911145, issued Jun 8, 1999).

Regarding claim 31, Aiken in view of Ching, Popp, Tamura does not teach, but Arora teaches “removing intradocument links from the files” (ie., remove a link between

Art Unit: 2176

pages that are part of a web site consisting or several related pages that link back to each other and homepage)(col 1, line 59 – col 2, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ching, Popp and Tamura to include removing links between pages that are part of a web site that link to one another as taught by Arora, providing the benefit of having a consistent style for all pages of a site (col 2, lines 7-14).

Response to Arguments

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101

The Examiner withdraws the rejection in the previous office action because the applicant amended the claims to recite “a computer implemented step” to make clear that a tangible media within the technological arts are called upon to carry out the steps of the method.

II. Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

A. Claims 26, 33

The applicant argues that Popp does not teach the *detecting step including the step of scanning the respective file for a group of characters, ... rendered and compare a group ... left file* (page 12, top). The Examiner disagrees because the Popp in conjunction with Aiken teaches this limitations. Popp teaches in col 2, lines 45-55 blocks of characters bounded by HTML tags and Aiken teaches the comparison of two

documents, side by side (see Fig 6). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include block of HTML statements as taught by Popp, providing the benefit of one-to-one mapping between each HTML element and object classes to manipulate the HTML element within and HTML document (Popp, Abstract).

B. Claims 1-25

1. The claims are not allowable in light of Applicant's Amendments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Specifically, the applicant argues amended claims (i.e., "generating a comparison result file"). The examiner introduces the Ching reference to teach these amended limitations in conjunction with the references already on record. This reference would have been obvious to include to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because it teaches comparison of document side by side (including HTML documents) and the results displayed to the user in a hierarchical file system.

2. The Office action properly combines numerous references to teach that the applicant's invention would have been obvious in view of these references.

The applicant argues that the great number of references precludes a finding of obviousness to combine the teachings to arrive at the claimed invention. The examiner disagrees. Specifically, The MPEP, in section 2145 says

V. ARGUING ABOUT THE NUMBER OF REFERENCES COMBINED

Reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, *without more*, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. In re Gorman, 933 F.2d

982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (Court affirmed a rejection of a detailed claim to a candy sucker shaped like a thumb on a stick based on thirteen prior art references.).

The great number of references in the instant case does not preclude an obviousness rejection because the applicant does not specifically show what the combined references does not teach. It is the examiner's position that, despite the great number of reference, the references in conjunction with one another would have made it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include the respective teachings of the supporting references and render the applicant's invention. Additionally, visually comparing files in a data processing system is well established technology in the art, as evidenced by the Webster, III reference (US 5142619, issued Aug 1992).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2176

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS

GS


SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER